

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,401	03/05/2001	Zuhua Zhu	NOVA-P015	8091
22877 7	7590 07/18/2002			
FERNANDEZ & ASSOCIATES LLP 1047 EL CAMINO REAL SUITE 201 MENLO PARK, CA 94025			EXAMINER	
			STONER, KILEY SHAWN	
	,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1725	7
			DATE MAILED: 07/18/2002	/

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 6) Other: 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Part of Paper No. 7 PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01) Office Action Summary

Application/Control Number: 09/800,401

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I (claims 1-13) in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-3 and 5-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-3 and 5-13 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,199,748 B1. This is a double patenting rejection.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA

Application/Control Number: 09/800,401

Art Unit: 1725

1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 4 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,748 B1. The only difference between claim 4 of the instant application and 6,199,748 B1 is that 6,199,748 B1 has the additional limitation of "at a temperature equal to or greater than Tm". Thus, claim 4 of the instant application is broader than claim 4 of 6,199,748 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the soaking step would have been implemented for a specific period of time in order to promote diffusion of the joint metal into the substrate pair. Therefore, the specific period of time of the instant application would have included those envisioned by claim 4 of 6,199,748 B1.

Conclusion

The prior art of record that is cited as of interest is presented on the form-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kiley Stoner whose telephone number is (703) 305-0723. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.).

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/800,401

Art Unit: 1725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on Monday-Friday. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Kiley Stoner 7-1-02 Olly Stone 1725